

A HISTORY OF SOCIO-CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH UNDER THE OCCUPATION OF JAPAN

Lieutenant Colonel Michael B. Meyer, USAF

April 2009

Visit our website for other free publication
downloads

<http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>

[To rate this publication click here.](#)

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. Authors of Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications enjoy full academic freedom, provided they do not disclose classified information, jeopardize operations security, or misrepresent official U.S. policy. Such academic freedom empowers them to offer new and sometimes controversial perspectives in the interest of furthering debate on key issues. This report is cleared for public release; distribution is unlimited.

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. As such, it is in the public domain, and under the provisions of Title 17, United States Code, Section 105, it may not be copyrighted.

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE APR 2009		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2009 to 00-00-2009	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A History of Socio-Cultural Intelligence and Research Under the Occupation of Japan			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 122 Forbes Avenue, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5244			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 29	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Comments pertaining to this report are invited and should be forwarded to: Director, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Ave, Carlisle, PA 17013-5244.

All Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) publications are available on the SSI homepage for electronic dissemination. Hard copies of this report also may be ordered from our homepage. SSI's homepage address is: *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil*.

The Strategic Studies Institute publishes a monthly e-mail newsletter to update the national security community on the research of our analysts, recent and forthcoming publications, and upcoming conferences sponsored by the Institute. Each newsletter also provides a strategic commentary by one of our research analysts. If you are interested in receiving this newsletter, please subscribe on our homepage at *www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/newsletter/*.

ISBN 1-58487-386-8

PREFACE

The U.S. Army War College provides an excellent environment for selected military officers and government civilians to reflect on and use their career experience to explore a wide range of strategic issues. To assure that the research conducted by Army War College students is available to Army and Department of Defense leaders, the Strategic Studies Institute publishes selected papers in its “Carlisle Papers in Security Strategy” Series.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Antulio J. Echevarria II', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

ANTULIO J. ECHEVARRIA II
Director of Research
Strategic Studies Institute

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

MICHAEL B. MEYER is the 2008-09 academic year Air Force National Defense Fellow in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. During the fellowship, he has specialized in cultural intelligence and public diplomacy. He is an intelligence officer and a political-military specialist, with a focus on the Middle East. Lieutenant Colonel Meyer was the Air Attaché in Damascus, Syria, and later the political advisor to the Commander, U.S. Central Command Air Forces. He commanded an Air Force recruiting squadron and was the deputy group commander of the Air Force's first network warfare group. Lieutenant Colonel Meyer is a graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy, holds an MA from the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School, and attended the Air Command and Staff College in Montgomery, Alabama.

ABSTRACT

American forces entered a seemingly dangerous and very foreign world following the surrender of Japan. A nation-building mission unlike any other previously in U.S. history ensued. Insight into Japanese sentiment and ways of conducting business would be paramount to the success of General Douglas MacArthur in demilitarizing and democratizing Japan. Two complementary but rival organizations within MacArthur's Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) staff were created and charged with understanding Japanese thought patterns and culture to assist with successful reform. The Research and Analysis Branch (R&A), subordinate to the Civil Intelligence Section (CIS), was responsible for turning out quality anecdotal intelligence analysis. It produced weekly "Occupational Trends" reports critical to monitoring Japanese sentiment on issues of seminal importance to demilitarization, such as Japanese popular opinion concerning the maintenance of the Emperor. The other organization, the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division (PO&SR) under the Civil Information and Education Section (CI&E), employed social scientists who worked closely with Japanese nationals on democratization. For perhaps the first time in history, sociological research supplemented traditional intelligence analysis in informing occupational leaders. PO&SR prepared scientific socio-cultural reports that served various sections across MacArthur's government. While rivalries existed between the R&A and PO&SR over methods and utility of services, the framework established under the occupation serves as a model of how to process and produce foreign socio-cultural intelligence and research during nation building. Analytic lessons learned include encouraging close cooperation between intelligence professionals and more specialized sociologists, incorporating diverse collection sources, working closely with host nationals, and formally documenting social science project findings.

A HISTORY OF SOCIO-CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH UNDER THE OCCUPATION OF JAPAN

This occupation has no historic guide. . . . It is similarly, an experiment, with the inevitable concomitants of trial and error. . . . In addition, there are the inevitable difficulties of a vastly different background, history, and experience and perhaps even more hampering, the legend that real understanding between East and West is impossible. . . . Objective and conclusive evaluations of psychological and sociological changes are always very difficult to make. . . . However, the present attitudes and the efforts of the Japanese can be studied and scientifically ascertained with a high degree of validity. . . . This system involves values that have evolved through centuries in the West, many of them completely at variance from those that have evolved through the centuries in the East. The Occupation has sought to speed these processes by its help in changing ideas and institutions.

From the October 15, 1948 report by
Dr. Florence Powdermaker, Social Scientist,
to Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers,
General Douglas MacArthur

American forces, just 2 weeks after the surrender of Japan, entered a very foreign world and assumed responsibility for a nation-building mission unlike any other previously in U.S. history. The legendary General Douglas MacArthur led an occupation government composed of a mixture of military and civilian personnel, few of whom had any practical experience in the rigors of shaping and governing a foreign society, especially one as different as Japan was from America. This was not Germany with a shared Western culture and tradition familiar to Americans.

MacArthur's authority to shape Japan was derived from his appointment in September 1945 by President Harry Truman as the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP). SCAP, in a general sense, also referred to the organization, or MacArthur's civil staff, which oversaw the occupation. Ten special staff sections would advise the Japanese government, and intervene, if necessary, to ensure the country was demilitarized and to orient the country down the path toward democracy.¹ In a White House memorandum, Truman charged MacArthur to "Exercise your authority as you deem proper to carry out your mission." The directive commanded that "Control of Japan shall be exercised through the Japanese Government to the extent that such an arrangement produces satisfactory results. This does not prejudice your right to act directly if required . . . [using] the employment of such measures as you deem necessary."² The Japanese civilian governmental structure from World War II would essentially remain intact, but MacArthur and SCAP would clearly have oversight of the bureaucracy.

Insight into Japanese sentiment and ways of conducting business would be paramount to the success of MacArthur and his staff.³ Analytic organizations centered on the Japanese mind and socio-cultural dynamics were essential in demilitarizing and democratizing Japan. A confederation of organizations responsible for presenting what was then termed as "civil intelligence," along with processing social science research, provided MacArthur's headquarters with vital socio-cultural information key to understanding Japanese behavior patterns and reactions to occupational reforms.⁴ In fact, the analytic framework established by SCAP in the occupation of Japan, although fraught with some

internecine rivalries and coordination challenges, serves as a model of how to process and produce foreign socio-cultural intelligence and research during a nation-building campaign.

This paper chronicles some of the major cultural challenges SCAP faced. It reviews the roles and accomplishments of the two most prominent analytic organizations that evolved to meet those socio-cultural challenges: Research and Analysis (R&A) Branch of Operations Division, under the Civil Intelligence Section (CIS), and Public Opinion and Sociological Research (PO&SR) Division, under the Civil Information and Education (CI&E) Section. While differences emerged between the two bodies due mainly to personalities, as well as over assessment methodologies and self-perceived value of services offered, their contributions in the field of analysis were complementary. Finally, this paper presents some lessons learned from the operations functions associated with socio-cultural analysis during an occupation.

Entrance into a “Sinister” Situation, Where “Every Japanese National is a Potential Enemy.”

Different than anticipated, MacArthur and SCAP members found a calm domestic security situation in Japan. A defeated and humbled people were eager for reform and change after the exhaustion of a decade and a half of war, which Japan waged across Asia. At the time, however, there was no assurance that occupation forces and occupational reforms would encounter what historian John Dower termed an “embrace” on the part of the Japanese.⁵ At least some form of resistance was expected. After all, as historian Stephen Ambrose remarked, World War II in the Pacific evoked unprecedented levels of animosity:

It was the worst war that ever was. World War II in Europe involved more people and land area, but it was a different war. It did not have the ferocity and rage that defined the war in the Pacific . . . the extent of the mutual hatred was higher than the tallest mountain and deeper than the bottom of the sea. . . . Highest and deepest of all was the hatred of the Japanese for the Americans, and of the Americans for the Japanese.⁶

Consequently, the initial occupation forces entering Japan did not know what to expect in terms of security and safety. Arriving for the first time in Japan on an airplane at a former military *kamikaze* training site, Atsugi Air Base, on August 30, 1945, the charismatic MacArthur acted in a somewhat foolhardy and irresponsible manner. MacArthur, with his usual flair for the dramatic, got in a Japanese car and caravan bound for his temporary headquarters in Yokohama, just outside Tokyo. He rode with minimum protection past 30,000 Japanese soldiers lining the streets. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill called this the bravest deed of the war.⁷ The American Shogun meant to demonstrate to an attentive Japanese audience that he and his forces were firmly in charge as SCAP embarked on its unprecedented mission.

Despite MacArthur’s bold behavior, even he realized his safety was not guaranteed; he reportedly had a food taster at the ready once he arrived at the Grand Hotel near the capital.⁸ Additionally on a broader scale, there were valid indicators before and during the occupation of lurking dangers and apparent challenges associated with molding the

Japanese mindset. Intelligence assessments hinted during the lead up to Allied victory in the Pacific and during the subsequent occupation of Japan, that U.S. forces and SCAP officials would face staunch opposition in the Japanese homeland. In the waning months and even weeks of the war, Japanese military personnel of all branches of the armed services engaged in last-ditch suicide attacks to stave off defeat. It was not just *kamikaze* suicide pilots who perished “for the undying glory of self and Emperor,” but also human mine suicide swimmers and ground suicide assault units. Upon the inevitable American military entry into Japan, it was suspected that at least some civilians would succumb to Japanese government propaganda that, in the run up to the occupation, called for ultimate sacrifice. An Office of Strategic Services (predecessor to the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA]) intelligence report released only 6 weeks before MacArthur landed at Atsugi Air Base noted:

Most recently, the Japanese in an effort to stimulate home front morale and also to frighten the Allies . . . have been threatening a last-ditch civilian resistance in the home islands. . . . Japanese spokesmen have described, “the natural aptitude of the Japanese to die to the last man,” and have pictured an entire nation armed physically and spiritually to stamp out an attempt to defile Japan’s sacred soil.⁹

Japanese acts of war continued even after the Emperor’s August 15 noon surrender address, which was broadcast on the radio across Japan to his public. Historian John Toland notes, “Words alone, even the Emperor’s, could not bring an abrupt end to the emotions war had engendered for more than 4 years.” This very day, 16 captured B-29 crewmembers were executed on Kyushu — where 4 days earlier, Japanese had beheaded eight other American airmen. Additionally, some Japanese pilots, having just listened to the Emperor’s speech, undertook one final *kamikaze* mission against U.S. forces.¹⁰

While the Japanese government made good faith gestures to begin demobilization of the Japanese military early in the occupation, some resistance was expected in the form of rogue cadres or, eventually, reconstituted militarist organizations. That assessment was extremely plausible considering the intense sentiment surrounding Japan’s pervasive involvement in Asia since the early 1930s. Since that time, in the name of Emperor Hirohito, whom the Japanese accepted as a direct descendent of the Sun Goddess, Amaterasu, Japan had waged what its proponents claimed was a holy war in China and a race war across the Pacific to rid the region of Anglo-Saxon influence.¹¹ Japan had shed much blood extending its sphere of influence, and it was reasonable to think that many would resent the presence of American “invaders.” Recall that less than 3 months before U.S. troops landed in mainland Japan, the Diet [parliament] passed a Wartime Emergency Measures Law, calling on the nation to mobilize if U.S. forces came ashore as an invasion force. “The controlled press waged a daily die-for-the-emperor campaign,” according to historian Herbert Bix.¹² SCAP occupation forces were entering a very foreign and potentially still hostile country.

Operation BLACKLIST, which laid out the occupation plan for Japan, predicted that “General intelligence problems will be enormously magnified, in contact with a fanatical population; every Japanese national is a potential enemy . . . sabotage and underground resistance are doubly menacing because of complicated language and race psychology. All intelligence agencies must face this sinister background and reorient their general

activities.”¹³ Occupation forces landing in Japan were met with various, and surprisingly, often warm welcomes. However, many Japanese were distrustful. Correspondingly, Americans faced the situation with trepidation. A serviceman’s perspective was instructive. In letters home to his wife, Army Chaplain Captain James Salango noted resentment in the eyes of some of the conquered Japanese during trips through the countryside:

These Japs amaze me. Every day they amaze me more. And in my amazement, there comes less understanding of them. They all salute us smartly, bow, scrape, and hiss when we go by, and yet deep down I can see their hostility in their eyes. I don’t think they think they have lost this war yet . . . I imagine that in their minds they know that we are suckers and they’ll put up with us while we are occupying them, but only so long as they can begin to rearm again.¹⁴

The post-war nation building period in Japan proved remarkably peaceful and without major incidents against SCAP occupation forces. However, as the case with any occupation following war, certain elements in society were opposed to foreign troops on their soil. A situation report of September 9 to the White House highlighted that “two wired bombs were found and deactivated in a high school building.”¹⁵ More insidious was behind-the-scenes plotting by former Japanese military members to potentially oppose the new order and, one day, stage a return to power. CIA documents declassified in 2005 reveal there was legitimate cause for concern that Japanese militarists might try to rise up again if the occupation had proved overly punitive in the minds of the Japanese. A network of Japanese army and navy officers, based on relationships developed at the Nakano intelligence school, conspired in the shadows by quietly keeping touch with one another and reportedly stashing away weapons.¹⁶ While a widespread, coherent threat never materialized, it was paramount that SCAP be mindful of sentiment fueling a popular backlash against the occupation. SCAP needed to create intelligence entities and organizations to monitor societal trends and dynamics that could prove harmful to moving Japan away from militarism while still respecting traditional Japanese institutions.

If monitoring, analyzing, and comprehending the psyche that had driven or at least allowed militarization to take root in Japan was not enough, occupation forces had also to counter a broader, more daunting challenge to the long-term mission—democratizing a totalitarian society.¹⁷ There was even supposition on the part of many prominent Japanese that democracy was not suited for Japan. The Japanese prime minister for much of the occupation period, Yoshida Shigeru, was highly skeptical that his country could become democratic. Historian John Dower notes, “In Yoshida’s typical elitist argument, the Japanese people were not capable of genuine self-government, and anyone who argued otherwise was either blinded by ethnocentrism or hypnotized by left-wing propaganda.”¹⁸ Additionally, MacArthur and Washington, because of pressing Cold War needs, recognized the occupation could not be an open-ended affair, despite reported suspicion on the part of many American officials that it could take perhaps multiple decades to reform Japan.¹⁹ In spite of seemingly huge challenges, SCAP set off on an ambitious agenda to first ensure Japan was pacified and demilitarized and then to change the political mindset of an entire populace on the path to democratizing Japan.

Grasping the “Oriental Mind”: The Need for Socio-Cultural Intelligence and Research Organizations.

In Japan, as in any foreign occupation, major personalities dominated policymaking on the victors’ side. The occupation’s senior leaders shaped the course of the mission based on previous personal and professional experiences in Asia and on their understanding of Japanese thought patterns. MacArthur had spent a large portion of his career in East Asia and considered himself an expert on the “Asian mind.” MacArthur’s Chief of Counter Intelligence, Brigadier General Elliot Thorpe, remembered MacArthur’s cultural genius during an interview in the late-1970s. “There isn’t any question that Douglas MacArthur was the greatest military figure in the Orient since Ghengis Khan. Laugh that off if you want to, but it’s true. . . . He really knew the Oriental mind. . . . Remember, as a young officer he was up with the Japanese Army in the Russo-Japanese War.”²⁰

As qualified a specialist as MacArthur might have been, he was largely an insular figure during the occupation, interacting with very few Japanese and lacking personal, daily knowledge of events in the field beyond his headquarters. A young SCAP staff officer confirmed what historians repeatedly wrote about MacArthur. “He never moved around Japan to see how the occupation was going or to get a visual impression. . . . He didn’t even go out to see Tokyo.”²¹ Understanding Japanese mindset and reaction to American reforms was bigger than the general. It would also require the skills of other experienced individuals and specialized units dedicated to the effort.

MacArthur’s military secretary and Chief of Psychological-Warfare Operations during the war, Brigadier General Bonner F. Fellers, exerted significant influence on MacArthur and SCAP policies during the occupation, including the seminal decision not to indict and remove Emperor Hirohito from power in the interest of maintaining calm in Japan. Fellers had long been a student of the country, serving a tour there in the late 1920s.²² During the 1934-35 academic year at the U.S. Army’s Command and General Staff College, he wrote “The Psychology of the Japanese Soldier.” Fellers’ work noted, “In methods of thought, the Japanese and the Americans are today as different as if each had always lived on different worlds, separated by hundreds of light years.” In 1944, he repackaged his staff college paper into “Answer to Japan,” which was used as a primer for Allied intelligence personnel.²³ Based on past experience and years of study, MacArthur and Fellers were more acquainted than most to the Asian mind, but they and a precious few seasoned Japan specialists in SCAP headquarters could not alone adequately assess daily socio-cultural trends and patterns as they worked to demilitarize and democratize Japan.

Analysis and reporting of socio-cultural factors during the occupation could have been left to the State Department and the CIA’s predecessor, the OSS—organizations typically charged with such responsibilities. However, because of past rivalries, and due to his dominant role during the occupation, State, and the OSS—as well as the CIA after its creation in 1947—were purposefully marginalized by MacArthur and SCAP.²⁴ The day-to-day assessment and analysis associated with gauging Japanese sentiment and societal reactions to American initiatives was, therefore, built into SCAP headquarter staff and occupational units’ missions.

No single organization during the occupation could claim a monopoly on assessing the Japanese mind and understanding Japanese culture.²⁵ Not only was there an absence of a socio-cultural intelligence and research “tsar,” but there appears to have been purposely overlapping cultural analysis efforts resident within MacArthur’s headquarters. An official U.S. Army history of the occupation highlights the existence of multiple intelligence, research, and surveillance sections under SCAP that “carried on continuous research and analysis and maintained close liaison with their counterparts in the Japanese government.”²⁶

Formally-created intelligence and research organs did not represent the occupiers’ comprehensive view into the Japanese psyche. Many occupation officials’ memoirs highlight the initiative of educated and inquisitive program action officers in the field as a valuable source for understanding the Japanese. Hans Baerwald, a renowned Japan specialist, who had spent part of his youth in Japan and later became a University of California at Los Angeles professor, worked in SCAP’s Government Section. Some of the most reliable and actionable information he obtained, which helped his section push through effective reforms, did not originate from traditional intelligence channels, but from direct liaison with counterparts in the Japanese Ministry of Justice’s Special Investigations Bureau.²⁷ This is not surprising, as aggressive program officers will always find pragmatic ways to scan and access their environment to accomplish tasks. Beyond those permanently assigned to Japan, assessments about the situation came also from outside SCAP. Renowned academic subject matter experts and U.S. Government consultants regularly traveled to Japan and provided reports and analyses directly to the White house and to MacArthur’s staff.

While the responsibility for understanding and applying socio-cultural information to demilitarize and democratize Japan fell, at least tangentially, to several SCAP organizations, two subunits of SCAP’s 10 special staff sections²⁸ were expressly charged with processing, analyzing, and disseminating socio-cultural intelligence and research. One was the Research and Analysis Branch (R&A) of Civil Intelligence Section’s (CIS) Operations Division, which provided key anecdotal classified intelligence reports and whose service was of particular utility during the early demilitarization phase of the occupation. The other was the Public Opinion and Social Research Division (PO&SR) of the Civil Information and Education Section (CI&E), which relied on polling data and more scientific sociological research methods to produce unclassified studies of great value to SCAP sections and leaders working to democratize Japan.²⁹

CIS and CI&E received their formal tasking in accordance with War, Navy, and State Department directives. That tasking was delivered from Washington in a SCAP Headquarters memorandum in the fall of 1945. The directives to all SCAP sections were labeled “Action Required or Objective to be Attained” and were purposefully general in nature. Examples of action required were “Suppression of Japanese militaristic and ultra-nationalistic propaganda” and “Encouragement of democratic organization in labor, industry, and agriculture.” Interestingly enough, the explicit order to conduct socio-cultural intelligence and research activities is not given, nor are the words “intelligence,” “assessment of,” or “research” present in the document.³⁰ Because these were implicit tasks, SCAP section leaders occasionally butted heads over responsibilities.

Civil Intelligence Section's Research and Analysis Branch (R&A)—How Anecdotal Intelligence Analysis Feed the Occupation's Demilitarization Phase.

Due to expected threats from militarists and subversives, SCAP leaders were dependent upon what was termed "civil" intelligence, immediately upon entry into Japan. Beginning in November 1945, just 2 months into the occupation, the R&A Branch was producing quality reports summarizing and analyzing threats to demilitarization. R&A examined sentiment from across Japan relating to Japanese cultural and psychological trends that both contributed to, and contradictorily threatened, near-to-intermediate term stability. R&A did this by weaving together and assessing a steady stream of "raw" reports from the field collected by counterintelligence units and sister CIS organizations under the 441st Counter Intelligence Corps, the Civil Censorship Detachment, as well as Japanese press pieces, translated by the Allied Translator and Interpreter Section (ATIS).³¹

R&A, along with its military staff, was blessed with talented analysts, including civilians with extensive background and great depth in Japan. The organization was headed by the following individuals in chronological order: Dr. E. H. Norman, a Canadian diplomat who lived in Japan prior to the war; Lieutenant Colonel T. P. Davis, a businessman in prewar Japan; Dr. H. S. Quigley, head of the University of Minnesota's political science department; and Dr. Harold J. Noble, a University of Oregon Far Eastern affairs specialist.³²

The organization's product began as the weekly "Situation Report Japan," which after 3 weeks, evolved into its trademark "Occupational Trends Japan and Korea." Its audience was comprised of theater commanders and War Department staff, in an attempt to give "a full picture of the civil side of occupational intelligence."³³ An examination of socio-cultural topics receiving the most coverage in "Occupational Trends" during the first several months of the occupation is warranted, since these are the issues that figured most prominently in securing and demilitarizing Japan.³⁴ While reports became more formal and standardized with time, broad subjects addressed fell into the fields of politics, economics, law and order, psychology, and education. Without monitoring and providing MacArthur, SCAP staff, and Washington feedback on Japanese sentiment linked to progress in enhancing stability early on in Japan, the more far-reaching goal of democratizing Japan would never have taken root.

A topic of the utmost importance to American security from the very beginning was Japanese opinion regarding the occupation. While the Japanese generally accepted the American presence, repeated references regarding confusion over occupational goals and the meaning of democracy appear in R&A's reports. "Occupational Trends" from December 21, 1945, noted, "A well-known Japanese liberal educated in the U.S. has pointed out that the occupation so far has been carried along lines which make common sense." The report goes on to quote the individual, "Now guide us in the necessary legal changes that must follow your directives."³⁵ A week later, drawing from a counter intelligence report, "Occupational Trends" noted, "The Japanese in Kyoto Prefecture are satisfied with the orders of SCAP, and they believe the occupation is being carried out very well. Many feel that the changes are being made too swiftly, however, and are confused."³⁶ Once again, a few weeks later in the report:

One of the major factors influencing this [positive perception] trend has been the actual behavior of these [American] forces—it has been completely contrary to their expectations which were taught by their leaders. . . . Respect for the United States and its form of government is increasing daily.³⁷

Finally, and not surprising in formerly totalitarian Japan, a January 9, 1946, “Occupational Trends” reported, “Most people fail to comprehend the meaning of democracy, its rights and obligations.”³⁸

Associated was the attitude that the promotion of meaningful political liberalization could take substantial time due to Japanese citizens having lived in a communal and authoritarian society very different from America’s.

Informants continue to say that the occupation must last for many years and urge a public declaration of this intent be made to bolster the confidence of the people in their newly gained political rights, one reported stated. The long suppression of individualistic tendencies on the part of the Japanese people has left an indelible mark which will not be quickly erased.³⁹

While most Japanese were satisfied with the benevolence and direction of the occupation, “Occupational Trends” addressed hints of possible threats and emotions that could threaten demilitarization and democratization. “Graduates of the Japanese spy school are rumored to have control of an underground movement. Radio school in Nakano was used as a blind to conceal subversive activities. Organization is said to have arms and supply caches all over Japan.”⁴⁰ Interestingly but not unexpectedly, the sentiment that drove Japanese military members to sacrifice their lives with suicide attacks still evoked strong emotional reactions during the early phases of the occupation. “A former Japanese Air Corps Captain reported to U.S. Military Police in Okayama that he believed it possible that violence against American occupation authorities and Japanese civilians was being planned by former members of the *Kamikaze* Corps. . . . He said possibilities of such an outbreak of violence was greater in Tokyo and other large urban areas.”⁴¹ In mid-1946, while watching American newsreels in movie theaters showing kamikaze footage from the war, “Joyful audience reaction to pictured *kamikaze* tactics is noted. . . . Asks a young woman from Yokohama, ‘I wonder why they clapped their hands when [there was a scene of] Japanese Special Attack planes dashing against an American warship.’ Another field correspondent, whose report was highlighted in “Occupational Trends,” writes, “A boy looking like a demobilized soldier clapped his hands, and others followed him with thunders of applause, and I saw some girls weeping into their handkerchiefs.”⁴²

No issue was of greater national significance to the Japanese people when it came to social stability than the role and future of Emperor Hirohito—the titular and spiritual head of the nation. In Tokyo, in Washington, and throughout America, the debate concerning whether to maintain the Emperor in power or to try him as a war criminal was a highly contentious issue after the cruel war in the Pacific. Convincing arguments were made on both sides as to whether or not MacArthur should allow Hirohito to keep his throne and to avoid punishment for war crimes. The pro-and anti-Emperor crowds debated long before the end of World War II, and wrangling continued well into the early phases of the occupation. However, the key decisionmaker, as stated earlier, was MacArthur.

A study of both primary sources from the era and secondary sources regarding the occupation indicate MacArthur and the U.S. Government were leaning toward keeping the Emperor even prior to SCAP's entry into Japan. Missing in the supposition that keeping Hirohito would be prudent was reporting on Japanese feedback. Covered in "Occupational Trends" were two separate polls of Japanese citizens from November and December of 1945, which indicated that over 90 percent were in support of keeping the Emperor system.⁴³ The December 21, 1945, "Occupational Trends" contributed this:

Anxiety on the part of the populace relative to the possible consideration of the Emperor as a war criminal is becoming increasingly apparent. . . . Except for very few individuals . . . the public seems to feel that the Emperor is an indispensable part of their national structure. . . . Some [cabinet ministers] are even evidently willing to become scapegoats for his sake.⁴⁴

A few weeks later, an edition quoting a Japanese citizen in Yamagata Prefecture noted,

There is much talk about continuance or discontinuance of the Imperial System. . . . The Emperor is no longer in the grip of the war lords. Released from the militarists grip, there is no danger concerning him. Any haphazard act in this direction will drive the nation into chaos, dissolution, and anarchy.

The potential for civil war, based on public sentiment, was noted in a February 1946 edition. Interestingly, one counterintelligence field unit picked up on, and R&A reported, the opinion that even with Emperor Hirohito still in power, the Japanese government would be no less democratic.⁴⁵ It was evident to top occupation authorities reading CIS reporting that protecting the Emperor—even if his powers were somewhat diminished—was important to demilitarizing and democratizing Japan. Noting MacArthur did not give the order to draft a new constitution until February 1946, which included as a provision the maintenance of the Emperor, Japanese attitudes expressed in repeated editions of "Occupational Trends" likely reinforced SCAP's decision to retain Hirohito.⁴⁶

Clearly an emotional topic with Japanese forces during the war, and closely related to the Emperor issue, was the status of Shinto as an official state religion. SCAP abolished Japanese state support for Shinto on December 16, 1945. For the sake of its audience—probably mostly those reading back in Washington—the following appeared in the first edition of "Occupational Trends" after MacArthur's directive. "For the first time in 75 years the Jap[anese] people will be free to doubt publicly the deity of the Emperor. The directive outlaws the doctrine which claims that the Emperor is superior to other state leaders because of divine origin."⁴⁷ Although not covered in as much depth as Japanese attitudes toward the occupation and status of the Emperor, subsequent "Occupational Trends" pulled together reports from the field on reactions to the Shinto directive. "Occupational Trends" highlighted that Tokyo papers gave extensive attention to the directive and mostly supported the move to decouple Shinto from the state. According to a Tokyo newspaper on December 17, "All the Shinto priests involved expressed their concurrence on the point of separating Shinto from the state." Japanese society, though, would be affected, and "Occupational Trends" picked up that the practice of indoctrination in schools would need to be amended.⁴⁸

R&A did a remarkable job in an uncertain and unfamiliar environment. “Occupational Trends” provided MacArthur and staff with comprehensive, well-written snapshots of Japanese sentiment on topics of great importance to officials seeking to disarm Japan of militants. Assessing the precise impact of R&A analytic reporting, or the contributions of its parent CIS, on the occupation is difficult. The official Army history of the Civil Intelligence Section highlights that point:

No absolutely definitive evaluation of CIS contribution to the success of the occupation at the close of 1948 was possible for several reasons. The very word “achievement” implies a statistical, overt contribution, whereas counterintelligence work, by and large, is a covert operation. . . . It was exceedingly difficult to prove that the complete tranquility of the population, the very absence of events and the discreet control of persons inimical to the objectives of the occupation constituted the major contribution of CIS to SCAP’s job in Japan. . . . The occupation of Japan ran too smoothly and quietly to make a good newspaper copy. . . . The tranquility of Japan, one of the major credits of the occupation was certainly traceable, at least in part, to the silent efficiency of . . . CIS.⁴⁹

Additionally, a review of the literature on the occupation-era lacks references to links between intelligence analysis and resulting SCAP program successes.⁵⁰ This is not unexpected, though, as governmental and military leaders are not permitted to comment candidly on classified intelligence or how that intelligence was used in formulating actionable programs.

Regardless, there are indicators that reveal the importance of R&A analysis within MacArthur’s headquarters. For instance, MacArthur personally signed off on the December 13, 1945, report with his trademark initials on the upper right hand corner of the first page of the document. Subsequent editions are marked with his aide-de-camp’s initials. Another sign that “Occupational Trends” was well received is the regularity with which it was published. “Occupational Trends” came out weekly, not ad hoc—a sign that reports were useful within SCAP. Over time, between December 1945 and through July 1946—the totality of “Occupational Trends” contained in the General MacArthur Memorial Archives—the reports’ content grew, and appearance improved. Mid-1946 versions of “Occupational Trends” were not only broader in scope and more detailed in-depth, but they were more slick and standardized in appearance than were the early editions produced in the winter of 1945-46. Additionally, multiple copies of “Occupational Trends” were printed for SCAP sections’ and Washington’s perusal—often more than 70 copies.⁵¹ Finally, as a testament to its utility, during the initial stages of the occupation, SCAP’s intelligence function, as a discipline, regularly suffered from personnel reductions.⁵² Presumably, if “Occupational Trends” was not an important source for SCAP leaders, it would have been cut or at least trimmed in favor of redirecting intelligence personnel and assets to other tasks and reporting venues. Instead, over time, it grew in scope and depth of analytic reporting. In summary, R&A’s assessments seem to have been the bedrock of socio-cultural intelligence analysis during the early demilitarization phase of the occupation.

Civil Information and Education Section's Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division (PO&SR) – Scientific, Sociological Research for the Occupation's Democratization Phase.

If CIS' R&A Branch best served senior SCAP leaders with valuable classified intelligence analysis, CI&E's PO&SR provided more detailed, rigorously-designed, and thought-out unclassified analytic pieces.⁵³ PO&SR products were widely circulated within and outside SCAP⁵⁴ and served long-term institution and democracy building efforts.

In addition to preparing studies and reports, PO&SR was officially charged with lending technical guidance and training to the Japanese.⁵⁵ PO&SR ran a significantly more modest and niche activity than did CIS. Four or five young American social scientists, depending on the specific time, led approximately 50 Japanese social scientists, translators, and clerical workers. This is in comparison to CIS' almost 2,000 employees. PO&SR employees of American and Japanese nationalities represented multiple socio-psychological academic disciplines. As social scientists, PO&SR staffers were naturally curious and held the belief, according to its director, John Bennett, that "Applied or program research is meaningful precisely to the extent that it is knowledge of social structure and cultural patterning." Their work was groundbreaking both in Japan and in the larger realm of social science. Bennett reminisced:

It was a period of eclectic search for social science principles, which could be applied to the real world wherever they worked successfully. Applied anthropology and applied sociology both owe their origins to this eclectic inter-disciplinary period. Most certainly, the PO&SR was another product of this interactive spirit.⁵⁶

While R&A and PO&SR relied on different collection strategies and products for dissemination, both were valuable reports and processors of socio-cultural information. Despite a common mission, there was no spirit of camaraderie between the organizations. MacArthur's intelligence chief's enmity toward social science research was apparent. Consequently, a rivalry, especially early on, existed between the two groups that Bennett highlighted:

[General Charles A. Willoughby] regarded scientific attitude surveying with contempt, holding the insistence on stratified samples and laborious interview methods to be time-consuming and unproductive of equivocal results at best. . . . Intelligence really won the power struggle, and in retrospect, it must be said that scientific social research was an intensive but small-scale activity in the Japan occupation.⁵⁷

This is not surprising, considering that sociology was still an unproven discipline.

An additional disadvantage that PO&SR suffered, alongside its CI&E parent organization, was lack of senior-level advocacy within SCAP. All other SCAP sections, except for Natural Resources, were headed by an Army general officer. A colonel led Natural Resources Section, and Marine Corps Lieutenant Colonel Donald R. Nugent was in charge of CI&E. PO&SR received less attention and recognition as a socio-cultural analytic organization than CIS. Bennett attributed CI&E's more modest standing to MacArthur's serving as his "own social reformer," with a closely-held "conception that changes in education patterns and in the ideas held by a population are most effectively handled

by personal presence, pronouncements, and great deeds, rather than by bureaucratic manipulation of the society or its media.”⁵⁸ Also, public polling and social research, unlike traditional intelligence, and again because of their immaturity as disciplines, were not areas that military commanders – MacArthur or others – were inclined to incorporate in their planning and decision cycles.

PO&SR’s relatively low status does not cloud the fact that it conducted meaningful, groundbreaking research supporting nation building in a very unfamiliar society. Its utility to the occupation as a useful tool was articulated by renowned psychiatrist and wartime naval officer, Dr. Florence Powdermaker, who toured Japan for 4 months in 1948 under SCAP’s Visiting Expert Program. Upon conclusion of her trip, Powdermaker provided an exit report to MacArthur, highlighting the potential contributions socio-cultural research could make in Japan. In her summary of observations, Powdermaker noted the difficulty of Americans working to bring about change in a society based on Eastern values. “The changing of values, the accepting of revolutionary ideas, are usually slow and often painful processes. The occupation has sought to speed these processes by its help in changing [Japanese] ideas and institutions.” She recognized the pitfall that “Few at [SCAP] Headquarters and elsewhere have the knowledge of Japanese history and customs which would enable them to interpret what we are trying to do . . . to help them build on or modify what they already have.” Furthermore, while “objective and conclusive evaluations of psychological and sociological changes are always very difficult to make . . . the present attitudes and efforts of the Japanese can be studied and scientifically ascertained with a high degree of validity.” Therefore, in order to achieve occupation objectives, there would need to be an “understanding of the Japanese and of methods of working with them which would be effective in getting their cooperation and friendship.”⁵⁹

Powdermaker recommended PO&SR be upgraded to full division status under CI&E, and SCAP leaders listened. PO&SR became a division with increased numbers of personnel assigned, and there was recognition that additional enhanced sociological research could play a meaningful role during the democratization phase of the occupation. Her report also laid out a collection framework and reporting plan based around three areas of Japanese social issues – or problems, as she labeled them: (1) changing relations between Japanese people and their government, (2) conflicts between traditional hierarchical organization of Japanese society and reforms to be achieved on the part of SCAP, and (3) sociological factors associated with both understanding and reforming the Japanese economy.⁶⁰ While Bennett’s personnel did not specifically tie each research project to these three areas, they were used as areas of general emphasis.⁶¹ Tasking for PO&SR products was designed to originate from program-oriented SCAP agencies, namely the 10 special staff sections and their subordinate units.

Calls for polling and sociological research in support of occupation goals, in theory, followed a standardized process. A 1950 CI&E document highlighting the mission and accomplishments of CI&E contained a cartoon-style graphic labeled “Steps in the Conduct of a Research Project.” A formal request for a project, according to the graphic, originated with a SCAP staff section before moving to a project design conference attended by that section, PO&SR, and Japanese government representatives. Then field work was to be designed and executed by PO&SR Americans and Japanese prior to a final report being

written, which was then provided back to the requesting SCAP staff section customer.⁶² Such a methodological process was rarely practiced, however, and a different dynamic evolved.

Bennett acknowledges that PO&SR's services were requested less often than they were offered by PO&SR staffers intimately familiar with the work of counterparts in other SCAP staff sections. Instead, his staff members, who were well-networked into other SCAP sections, increasingly gained a sense for which specific socio-cultural issues and problems most needed to be tackled to reform Japan. "Through various forms of personal association, it was possible for PO&SR people to initiate research, merely by helping their friends in the action programs to formulate questions and problems."⁶³

Contrary to Willoughby's notion that sociological studies always entailed a lengthy and laborious execution process, PO&SR sometimes conducted impromptu research and surveys under chaotic conditions. Bennett described a quick turnaround polling public opinion study done to support SCAP's Labor Division during the July 1949 Tokyo Transport Workers Strike. Within a few hours of the strike breaking out in the morning, PO&SR paired up with the Japanese Jiji Press Public Opinion Section and developed a questionnaire that was deployed to the field in the hands of a few American workers and about 70 Japanese students.

After indescribable confusion and noise, we dispatched the interviewers—some on foot, the rest in jeeps. It was quite a sight—the interviewers lined up with the American sergeant writing out their passes, giving the dispatch slip to the [U.S. military] driver, and then with me yelling out the names and packing them into the right jeep, we would then roar out from the motor pool yard.

The last interviewer did not return to the headquarters support office until midnight. Bennett and a few others had remained in the office, working and "drinking beer which I [Bennett] got from the Dai Ichi grill and bar, and eating sushi." The report was written by the next night and distributed with Nugent's approval to SCAP senior leaders just a few days later. Bennett reminisces, "It was quite an experience."⁶⁴

One major factor contributing to PO&SR's success in accurately capturing, comprehending, and reporting on socio-cultural issues was that project execution was intimately tied to Japanese hosts. A small American staff expressed a genuine feeling of camaraderie with its Japanese staffers. Japanese and American staffers always accompanied one another in the field, and Japanese workers did most of the hands-on interviews, which was partially because the occupation officials did not have the requisite language skills. In short, Japanese staffers were viewed by personnel in the division as colleagues rather than as subjects who had been conquered. "We took the position that Japan was the important thing, not America."⁶⁵

PO&SR's work in support of several SCAP sections was noteworthy in democratizing Japan. After its establishment as a division in 1948 and up until the end of the occupation in 1952, PO&SR produced 32 attitude surveys and over 30 memorandums and socio-cultural studies for distribution within MacArthur's SCAP Headquarters. The largest contributions were in the fields of women's rights, population, marriage and family issues, financial reforms, labor, and land reform.⁶⁶ At the end of World War II, almost 30 percent of Japanese farmers owned no land. Japan's farming industry was essentially a feudal agricultural system. The majority of Japanese farmers were tenant peasants, working

large plots of land for wealthier land owners.⁶⁷ SCAP policies, based in part on findings from PO&SR reports, ensured land was more equitably distributed to small farmers. Farm productivity went appreciably up as formerly impoverished farmers became self-sustaining.⁶⁸ An occupation official in the Government Section, Hans Baerwald, mentioned above, noted that after land reforms, land tenancy was near zero. "Land reform . . . was the most successful pillar of economic democratization."⁶⁹ Along the same topical line, Bennett points to victory associated with the report, "Japanese Village in Transition," which was widely distributed in the United States and served as a baseline for further American and Japanese studies on this topic.⁷⁰

As for PO&SR accomplishments, staffers trained some of Japan's top officials in polling techniques—a practice not common before the occupation. Bennett's personnel assisted in establishing Japan's most influential surveying entity—the Nation Public Opinion Institute—in the office of the prime minister. Finally, PO&SR members, aside from their research projects, were instrumental in providing both formal and informal consulting advice to top SCAP officials:

It was, in fact, this informational function which constituted our major service to the occupation. . . . From time to time, PO&SR staff members would be called upon to talk to important military or SCAP officials who were about to engage in particular programs, or who were in route to new assignments. . . . As social scientists, our unique contribution lay in our ability to search for and interpret fundamental patterns of Japanese life. . . . We insisted at all times that it was necessary to view Japan as a complex modern nation with a culture of antiquity and depth, deserving of the utmost respect—and not as a backward, untrustworthy people.⁷¹

Intelligence's analytic contributions were critical in quickly examining and reporting on current developments in Japan, but it was social scientists who built many figurative bridges between the host culture and American methods to sustain true reform.

Socio-Cultural Intelligence and Research Lessons Learned.

Robert Textor, who served as an official in CI&E and later became a Stanford professor, wrote about the occupation 4 decades after the endeavor: "The . . . occupation of Japan . . . was, in my view, the most ambitious occupation the world has seen since the emergence of the nation state."⁷² MacArthur's and SCAP's success in Japan is undeniable. By the end of the occupation in 1952, Japan had been successfully demilitarized, unmistakably reformed, and was well on the way to becoming a functioning democracy. Even before American forces landed in Japan, MacArthur and top American officials recognized that the occupation government would need to better understand the Japanese and appreciate their culture in order to steer that country's political and bureaucratic systems on a more liberal path. CI&E chief Nugent wrote, "These [Japanese thought and behavioral] patterns have existed for years, even centuries, and it was recognized in the beginning that attempts to alter them overnight would result in misunderstanding and confusion . . . Patience and persistence . . . have been and are considered indispensable to accomplish reorientation and reeducation of the Japanese people."⁷³ As reforms were designed and introduced, socio-cultural intelligence and research provided the critical background for constructively reforming Japan.

Lessons can be drawn from the analytic successes associated with socio-cultural intelligence and research during the occupation. First, success in understanding the Japanese target audience was predicated on having closely observed that audience for years. America and SCAP did not begin at a cold start when analyzing Japanese culture and thought patterns. From the very beginnings of the occupation, Americans drew on experience gained studying the Japanese psyche during almost 4 years of war in the Pacific. In addition to training designed to prepare service men to fight the Japanese on the field of battle, Civil Training Schools in the states had prepared a cadre of Americans to work in Japan after the conclusion of hostilities. Those schools were operations- and not intelligence-oriented institutions, but inherent in their curriculum was the understanding that reforming Japan would be quite different from reforming a western country like Germany.

Second, the occupation benefitted from advances made in applying some of the emerging, more formal theories of social science. Social science, for perhaps the first time, served alongside traditional intelligence in helping to reform an entire society. Sociologists were willing and motivated to get involved and make a difference. The researchers of PO&SR, because they appreciated Japanese culture, gained tremendous insight into how to pair up American decrees and initiatives with Japanese practices to guarantee success. Along with close physical proximity to the Japanese public, PO&SR researchers maintained a spirit of equality and collegueship with their eager Japanese staffers. A healthy spirit of trust and respect developed not only between American sociologists and their Japanese “subjects of study,” but also between the American researchers and their Japanese professional counterparts who would remain behind to drive Japan further down the road to democratization after the occupation ended in 1952.

Both intelligence analysts and social researchers had varied and well-entrenched data gatherers and collection resources on which to base their assessments. As emphasized in Bennett’s writings and as is evident from where R&A drew its “raw” data, analysts and social scientists in headquarters had access to multiple and diverse sources – intelligence officers spread across all Japan’s prefectures, counterintelligence personnel, press reporting, and translators. Collectors, whether intelligence officers serving under CIS or sociologists in the case of PO&SR, were either in close proximity to the Japanese or they were Japanese citizens themselves. This ensured that collectors fed analysts with essential, first hand Japanese perspectives, and not speculative conjunctures seen through an outsider’s lens or derived from less impersonal, technical forms of intelligence. Human intelligence was vital to determine motivations and intentions. Obviously, helping was that this was a benevolent occupation, characterized by mutual respect and one that encouraged a generally open dialogue between the Japanese and American intelligence collectors, as well as social science data gathers, from all organizations.

Finally, with regard to accomplishments, although SCAP—dominated by the military—ran the occupation, it employed what today we call an interagency approach to the issues surrounding socio-cultural intelligence and research. The occupation was truly a collaborative endeavor between military and civil functions. Despite only minimal State Department and OSS—later CIA—participation on the ground, intelligence and research gaps were addressed by various military and civilian personnel from multiple disciplines and specialties. Military officers and troops not accustomed to working in an

academic environment were supplemented with formally trained and educated civilians better attuned to cultural sensitivities and practices. These civilians had the requisite skills to design and carry out the complicated sociological research and detailed polling operations that flourished in Japan.⁷⁴ Additionally, expertise not resident in the occupation government was supplemented by welcoming part-time civilian professionals into Japan under the Visiting Experts Program. In short, the occupation successfully blended together a mix of military intelligence personnel with experienced civilian researchers in a full spectrum collection, analysis, and reporting cycle, to a degree previously unseen during an occupation, or likely even during a diplomatic venture in a foreign land. It was not always a coordinated effort, but it was – even if by circumstance – a rather comprehensive effort.

Sadly lacking, however, was extensive cross communication and trust between intelligence professionals and sociologists. When examining the analytic process throughout the occupation, it is evident that the two parallel subject matters – intelligence and sociological research – were not conceived of as common or complementary functions. Willoughby was notorious for his lack of conciliation.⁷⁵ He looked at social research with disdain, which bled over into sometimes strained internal SCAP relations. Closer coordination between the data collectors and analysts in a more collegial and formal corporate setting could have provided more synergy in examining Japanese thought patterns. Joint collection, analysis, reporting, and dissemination meetings and boards, chaired by MacArthur or another senior representative above Willoughby or Nugent, would have better served SCAP leadership and Washington. There was more than enough analytic work to go around during such a huge nation-building mission. A complimentary approach, as well as occasional plugs for PO&SR to other SCAP sections by intelligence, especially when intelligence realized it did not have the expertise to design polls or complex academic studies, would likely have avoided redundancy and resulted in PO&SR's valuable services being officially requested more frequently on the part of other staff sections.

Finally, unlike the review of “civil intelligence” under the occupation, which was conducted shortly after the war and the results of which were reported in the *Army's Reports of General MacArthur* from 1950 and in *Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section: GHQ, FEC, & SCAP* from 1949, there appears to have been no formal government-sanctioned social science lessons drawn from the occupation. This would have greatly benefitted both intelligence and social scientists for years to come during other nation-building ventures. Not until 1963, did Bennett publish PO&SR accomplishments in the book *Paternalism and the Japanese Economy: Anthropological Studies of Oyabun-Kobun Patterns*, through a civilian publisher.⁷⁶ He recounted that he and his PO&SR colleagues were resigned to the fact that they played a clear second fiddle to intelligence. They often isolated themselves, on purpose, from fellow SCAP members. “We avoided overly close contact with other Americans in the occupation. . . . We mingled chiefly with those Americans who thought about Japan as we did, and this meant we excluded ourselves from most social circles of occupation society.” He seemed resigned, and even smugly satisfied, that his organization played largely an academic and not as much a “policy inject” role.⁷⁷ While Bennett was a civilian at a disadvantage in SCAP's predominantly military culture, he might have, along with his CI&E boss, Nugent, been more aggressive in regularly publicizing and promoting PO&SR's important contributions to a government audience.

As Powdermaker convincingly made the case to MacArthur in 1948, social science had something valuable to contribute to the occupation. Nugent and Bennett should have been more vociferous in representing their capabilities to the other SCAP staff sections and in building standardized social science research, and particularly reporting, processes. PO&SR was elevated to a division, not to hide in the occupation, but to do meaningful studies across the SCAP sections by peddling its unique wares. It did that, but not to the degree it likely could have with a more vocal effort to promote its services. Through the fault of military leaders and civilian researchers alike, a unique opportunity was missed to tightly integrate newly-minted, formal socio-cultural research with traditional intelligence.

In hindsight, nation building in Japan was not as challenging as it has been in Iraq and Afghanistan. Reforming a homogenous and economically productive society like Japan, which embraced defeat and reform, was easier than stabilizing and reconstructing heterogeneous, tribal, and economically-less-developed countries like Iraq or Afghanistan. However, analytic lessons learned in Japan about how to draw upon collectors and data gathers embedded into society on a collegial basis, and about how to divide labor between intelligence and social science researchers are universal. Assuming a government involved in nation building today can overcome the internal rivalries of organizations and personalities, the socio-cultural analysis endeavor undertaken in Japan could serve as a good prototype for how to meld together complementary and critical intelligence and social science functions to understand foreign thought patterns.

ENDNOTES

1. There was some overlap between his traditional Army Forces Pacific military staff (composed of "G" directorates) and SCAP sections, although SCAP was technically separate. *Reports of General MacArthur, MacArthur in Japan: The Occupation: Military Phase*—Prepared by his General Staff, Vol. I, Chap. III, www.history.army.mil/books/wwii/macarthur%20reports/macarthur%20v1%20sup/ch3.htm.

2. Dennis Merrill, ed., *Papers of Harry S. Truman: President's Secretary's File*, Document #14—White House Press Release Clarifying SCAP Authorities, in *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency, Vol. 5, Creating a Pluralistic Democracy in Japan: The Occupation Government 1945-1952*, Frederick, MD: University Publications of America, 1996, p. 42. Truman vested power in MacArthur as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers on September 6, 1945, and two messages were released to the general on September 22 and 24. The occupation of Japan, due in part to limited resources because of the concurrent occupation in Germany, necessitated essentially keeping the existing Japanese governmental bureaucratic structure largely intact. In Germany, the nations of the Allied victors actually created and staffed the government. MacArthur, meanwhile, paired up SCAP sections and organizations with Japanese government organizations. According to the memo coordinated through the State, War, and Navy Departments, SCAP would give "Intentions of the Potsdam Declaration full effect."

3. In the past decade, a number of significant historical works, some of which have included Pulitzer Prize winners, have covered the occupation period in Japan. Prominent historians and their associated works include Takemae Eiji, *The Allied Occupation of Japan*, London, UK:

Continuum, 2002; John W. Downer, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1999; Herbert P. Bix, *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan*, New York: Perennial, 2001; and Walter LaFeber, *The Clash: US-Japanese Relations Throughout History*, New York: W. W. Norton, 1998. MacArthur and the American Century: A Reader, William M. Leary, ed., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001, devotes a major portion of the book to the occupation, as well containing an essay on MacArthur and Military Intelligence by Edward Drea. Another solid reference is a chapter in *America's Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq*, James Dobbins, ed., Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2003. A renowned analysis of Japanese culture, which was commissioned during the war by the U.S. Government, is Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1946. While all the works are excellent sources, none contain specific, detailed coverage of the socio-cultural intelligence and research effort during the occupation. This is notable, as the U.S. Government today struggles with how best to use and disseminate socio-cultural intelligence and how to optimally fuse the social sciences with traditional intelligence.

4. In a 1949 military manual from MacArthur's Far East Command General Headquarters, *civil intelligence* is "In contradistinction to *theater intelligence* in the tactical and strategic field." Instead, *civil intelligence* "Contained the suggestion that the intelligence interest was on a civil and population basis." *Intelligence Series, I*, Vol. 9, *Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section: GHQ, FEC, & SCAP*, 1949, 1, Records Group 23, MacArthur Memorial Archives, Norfolk, VA. What emerged in setting up intelligence and social research analysis is purposely termed a structure or confederation, and not a consolidated enterprise, since labeling socio-cultural analytic efforts under SCAP as an enterprise would indicate that the intelligence personnel and social scientists waged a coordinated, cooperative effort. They did not. As will be covered, rivalries existed between intelligence and social science organizations under the occupation. However, while their organizations' energies and products were not intentionally coordinated, as a whole, they provided MacArthur and staff with useful analysis and insight upon which to craft a hugely successful nation building campaign.

5. Dower, p. 227. Dower writes, "Japanese at all levels of society embraced the new supreme commander with an ardor hitherto reserved for the Emperor, and commonly treated GHQ with the deference they had until recently accorded their own military leaders."

6. Stephen E. Ambrose, *To America: Personal Reflections of an Historian*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002, p. 101.

7. LaFeber, p. 261.

8. The Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, "Interview with Wendall W. Woodbury, 4 June 1993," [lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/S?ammem/mfdipbib:@field\(AUTHOR+@od1\(Woodbury,+Wendell+W+\)\)](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/S?ammem/mfdipbib:@field(AUTHOR+@od1(Woodbury,+Wendell+W+))). Woodbury performed consular duties during the occupation.

9. CIA Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room, "Japan's 'Secret' Weapon: Suicide" – Current Intelligence Study #31, Washington, DC: Office of Strategic Studies, Research and Analysis Branch, 20 July 1945," www.foia.cia.gov/browse_docs.asp.

10. John Toland, *The Rising Sun: The Decline and Fall of the Japanese Empire, 1936-1945*, New York: The Modern Library, 1970, pp. 852-854.

11. Bix, pp. 317-357.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 495.
13. Citation from Operation "Blacklist" included in *Intelligence Series, I, Vol. 9, Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section*, p. 8.
14. James Salango to his wife, letters, September 27, 1945, p 3, and October 9, 1945, p. 2, Papers of Capt James Salango, Chaplain, USA, 1942-1946, Records Group 64, Box 3, Folder #2, MacArthur Memorial Archives, Norfolk, VA.
15. Dennis Merrill, ed., Papers of Harry S. Truman: President's Secretary's File, Document #9—Current Foreign Developments, p. 42.
16. The 2005 documents reveal that MacArthur's G-2, Major General Charles Willoughby ran a clandestine endeavor, termed Operation TAKEMATSU, through the former Japanese chief of the intelligence department at Imperial Headquarters at the end of the war, General Arisue Seizo, to keep tabs on ultranationalist organizations and simultaneously monitor communist elements active in the country. For details, see Michael Peterson, "The Intelligence That Wasn't: CIA Files, the U.S. Army, and Intelligence Gathering in Occupied Japan," in *Researching Japanese War Crimes Records: Introductory Essays*, Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Administration for the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group, 2006, pp. 198-230.
17. *Intelligence Series, I, Vol. 9, Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section*, 2. According to this source, "General MacArthur's far sighted politico-economic objectives never changed, but their implementation by lower echelons of the occupation was marked by constant transitions and discreet adjustments to fulfill the broad plan of democratizing one of the most thoroughly totalitarian nations in the world."
18. Dower, p. 84.
19. "Interview with Wendall W. Woodbury, 4 June 1993," The Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, [lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/S?ammem/mfdipbib:@field\(AUTHOR+@od1\(Woodbury,+Wendell+W+\)\)](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/S?ammem/mfdipbib:@field(AUTHOR+@od1(Woodbury,+Wendell+W+))). Woodbury noted, "Most occupation officials thought it would have to go on for a hundred years to teach the Japanese democracy and how to run trains and build ships."
20. Oral Reminiscences of Brigadier General Elliot R. Thorpe, Sarasota, Florida, 29 May 1977, Clayton James Collection Records Group, Records Group 49, Box 2, Folder # 68, MacArthur Memorial Archives, Norfolk, VA.
21. "Interview with Albert L. Seligman, 27 January 2000," The Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, [lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/S?ammem/mfdipbib:@field\(AUTHOR+@od1\(Seligmann,+Albert+Louis,+1925-\)\)](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/S?ammem/mfdipbib:@field(AUTHOR+@od1(Seligmann,+Albert+Louis,+1925-))).
22. Eiji, p. 137.
23. Dower, p. 280.

24. Historian Edward Drea wrote, "As supreme commander in Tokyo during the occupation of Japan, MacArthur's distrust of Washington resurfaced. He showed little confidence in CIA or State Department intelligence sources and, instead growing ever more isolated, placed increasing trust in [his G-2's] Willoughby's intelligence estimates." Edward J. Drea, "Military Intelligence and MacArthur: 1941-1951, a Reappraisal," in *MacArthur and the American Century*, p. 197.

25. Japan was "blanketed . . . with a nationwide, mutually supporting system of intelligence and information coverage." Intelligence coverage of Japan during the occupation was intentionally duplicitous. *Intelligence Series, I, Vol. 9, Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section*, p. 1.

26. *Reports of General MacArthur*, Chapter III.

27. Hans Baerwald, telephone interview by the author, October 16, 2008.

28. The 10 special SCAP staff sections, activated on October 2, 1945, included Economic and Scientific, Civil Information Education, Natural Resources, Public Health and Welfare, Government, Legal, Civil Communications, Statistics and Reports, Civil Intelligence, and Office of the General Procurement Agent. Civil Intelligence (or CIS) would disappear and be absorbed temporary into Willoughby's G-2 staff, from May 3, 1946, until August 29, 1946. Then in August, CIS was formally reinstated as a special staff section, but it was still under the operational control of Willoughby, who, beyond his G-2 status, was named as Chief of CIS.

29. The post-World War II era in Japan coincided with the mid-1990's growth, specialization, and formalization of sociology and the social sciences. More rigorous survey methods were introduced, and sociology theory and methods were codified.

30. Staff Memorandum #6, Allocation of SCAP Staff Responsibilities, 28 November 1945, Papers of Major General Richard A. Marshall, Series I: Official Correspondence, Records Group 29c, Box 3, Folder #2, MacArthur Memorial Archives, Norfolk, VA.

31. *Reports of General MacArthur*, Chapter III and *Intelligence Series, I, Vol. 9, Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section*, p. 14.

32. *Ibid.*

33. *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 138.

34. "Occupational Trends" reporting was closely examined by the author from the winter of 1945-46 and summer of 1946, Records Group 4, Box 37, Folder #1, MacArthur Memorial Archives, Norfolk, VA. While Korea was also covered, early "Occupational Trends" were weighted largely toward Japan over Korea. For purposes of this paper, the focus on R&A is on the first several months of the occupation—the ones that dealt mostly with demilitarization. R&A—while still subordinate to Operations Division—would later meld into Publications Subsection after Maj Gen Willoughby assumed operational control of CIS in the summer of 1946. With the change in leadership, the analysis focus then reoriented from coverage mostly on subversive or right-wing activity to counterintelligence and press censorship associated with Willoughby's concern over communism creeping into Japan. For information on the re-subordination of CIS and the evolution of R&A to Publications Subsection, see *Ibid.*, pp. 61-76, as well as Eiji, pp. 161-168.

35. "Occupational Trends," December 21, 1945, p. 22.

36. *Ibid.*, December 28, 1945, p. 15.
37. *Ibid.*, January 23, 1946, p. 16.
38. *Ibid.*, January 9, 1946, p. 5.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
40. *Ibid.*, December 28, 1945, p. 5.
41. *Ibid.*, January 2, 1946, p. 11.
42. *Ibid.*, July 16, 1946, p. 8.
43. *Ibid.*, January 23, 1946, pp. 18-19.
44. *Ibid.*, December 21, 1945, pp. 20, 23.
45. *Ibid.*, January 9, 1946, p. 4; and February 6, 1946, pp. 15-16.
46. Certainly playing prominently into MacArthur's decision were private meetings with the Emperor, the first of which took place on September 27, 1945.
47. "Occupational Trends," December 21, 1945, p. 23.
48. *Ibid.*, December 28, 1945, p. 13; and January 2, 1946, p. 9. Perhaps due to mirror imaging on the part of writers and editors producing "Occupational Trends" and considering that religion is decoupled from the state in the United States, the Shinto directive did not receive the relative amount of attention in "Trends" that the Emperor question did, despite Shinto being a pervasive part of Japanese citizens' lives.
49. *Reports of General MacArthur*, Chapter III and *Intelligence Series, I*, Vol. 9, *Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section*, p. 133.
50. This comment is based on the author's research of primary and secondary resources. None of the prominent secondary sources by distinguished scholars and authors on the subject of the occupation draw a direct correlation between intelligence reporting and its impact on specific occupational initiatives and reforms. That is not to say that analysis and research organizations did not play a key role; intelligence and research organizations' accomplishments are just not highlighted in the literature. Additionally, the presidential papers of President Harry S. Truman dedicated to the period of the occupation—150 documents in all, as well as the vast resources at Norfolk's MacArthur Memorial Archives, do not highlight specific ties between intelligence analysis and success in Japan. Inquiries by the author about the unequivocal impact intelligence and research organizations on MacArthur and SCAP to an experienced Archivist at the MacArthur Memorial, James Zobel, who has held the post for 20 years, were likewise unsuccessful.
51. The MacArthur Archives maintains only one copy of each edition of "Occupational Trends" in its hard files. It is impossible to tell specifically how many copies of each edition was made; however, of the 25 editions in the archives from between December 1945 and July 1946, nine of the editions are labeled as copy #73 or above. All January 1946 editions are labeled as

#99. The May 1, 1946, edition is copy #117; May 22, 1946, is copy #140, and May 29, 1946, is copy #115.

52. *Intelligence Series, I*, Vol. 9, *Operations of the Civil Intelligence Section*, p. 133. "If practical contributions of intelligence could have been more easily measured . . . [intelligence] might not have been forced to struggle constantly with manpower boards, personnel reductions, and appropriations committees."

53. PO&SR grew out of CI&E's Analysis and Research branch. It was upgraded to division status in October 1948. CI&E was headed from September 1945 to May 1946 by former National Broadcasting executive, Brigadier General Kermit Dyke, who left the occupation early, having been labeled by more conservative elements in SCAP as "that damned pink." His replacement, Marine Lieutenant Colonel Donald R. Nugent, was a Japan specialist and reportedly much more conservative. Eiji, pp. 180-181. This paper deals with research conducted by PO&SR at the organization's apex, as a division, from 1948 through the end of the occupation.

54. John W. Bennett, "A History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division, SCAP." Previously published in *Paternalism and the Japanese Economy: Anthropological Studies of Oyabun-Kobun Patterns*, this reference comes from an on-line section entitled "History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division (SCAP)," Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963, library.osu.edu/sites/rarebooks/japan/3a_docs.html.

55. *Mission and Accomplishments of the Occupation in the Civil Information and Education Fields*, January 1, 1950, Records Group 31, Box 9, Folder #1, MacArthur Memorial Archives, Norfolk, VA.

56. Bennett, on-line sections, "A History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division (SCAP)," and "Biographical Introduction."

57. *Ibid.*

58. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

59. Florence Powdermaker, *Social Reaction to Occupation*, October 1948, SCAP Occupation Staff Sections, CI&E, Records Group 5, Box 112, Folder #3, 2-3, 6, MacArthur Memorial Archives, Norfolk, VA.

60. Powdermaker, Lt Col Nugent's introduction memorandum entitled "Subject: Submission of Report of Doctor Powdermaker," October 22, 1948, as well as the actual Powdermaker report, p. 5.

61. Bennett, "A History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division (SCAP)."

62. *Mission and Accomplishments of the Occupation in the Civil and Education Fields*, 28.

63. Bennett, "A History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division (SCAP)."

64. John W. Bennett, "Some Procedures and Problems of the PO&SR Division, CIE (SCAP)," library.osu.edu/sites/rarebooks/japan/3b_docs.html.

65. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

66. Bennett, "A History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division, SCAP."

67. Dennis Merrill, ed., *Papers of Harry S. Truman: President's Secretary's File, Document #32 – Farm Tenancy in Japan*, Natural Resources Section Report #79, Papers of Kenneth W. Bunce, 1947, in *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency, Vol. 5, Creating a Pluralistic Democracy in Japan: The Occupation Government 1945-1952*, Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1996, p. 190.

68. Eiji, p. 544.

69. Hans Baerwald, "The Occupation of Japan as an Exercise in 'Regime Change': Reflections after Fifty Years by a Participant," in *Japan Policy Research Institute Occasional Paper #29*, February 2003, www.jpri.org/publications/occasionalpapers/op29.html.

70. Bennett, "A History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division."

71. *Ibid.*

72. Robert B. Textor, "Success in Japan—Despite Some Human Foibles and Cultural Problems," in *MacArthur and the American Century: A Reader*, p. 277.

73. "Mission and Accomplishments of the Occupation in the Civil and Education Fields," p. 1.

74. The challenge of military officers inexperienced in a largely civilian atmosphere was also partially overcome by the fact that some of SCAP's more senior military officers were—before the war—well-established civilians and specialists from a mix of careers.

75. Willoughby was an admirer of Italy's Benito Mussolini and Spain's General Francisco Franco. MacArthur called Willoughby "my lovable fascist." Eiji, p. 161.

76. Bennett, "A History of the Public Opinion and Sociological Research Division."

77. *Ibid.*